Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall take note of it. I do not find any force in the other points raised by the hon. Members. I call upon the hon. Chief Minister to introduce the Bills.

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL.—I beg to introduce the Mysore Police (Amendment) Bill, 1969.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, I am on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall permit the hon. member after the introduction of Bills is over.

Sri H. N. NANJE GOWDA.—Sir, I raise objection under rule 71.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon. Member may bring it to my notice in my chambers. I have given my ruling right or wrong it binds on all the hon. Members.

Sri H. N. NANJE GOWDA.—Points of order cannot be discussed in the chambers.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I call upon the Hon. Minister for Finance.

Mysore Sales Tax (Amendment) and (Second Amendment) Bills, 1969.

Introduction.

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Minister for Finance, Planning and Youth Welfare).—Sri, I beg to introduce :

(*a*) The Mysore Sales Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1969;

(*b*) The Mysore Sales Tax (Second Amendment) Bill, 1969.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, when several points of orders have been raised on the floor of the House I think that should be given priority over the other business. Whether the Hon. Chair admits the points of orders or not is a different matter. Anyway I only request the Hon. Chair to give a patient hearing to the points of orders.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I quite appreciate the observations made by the Hon. Leader of Opposition. He might have also noted that I gave a very patient hearing to the observations made by Hon. Member Sri Nagappa, hon. Member Sri Nanje Gowda and hon. Member Sri M. S. Krishnan. Only after giving a patient hearing to their points I gave my ruling. If the hon. Members are not satisfied with the ruling or if they feel that the ruling is not correct it is left to them. But the ruling given by me, whether it is right or wrong, is binding on all hon. Members. The objections raised by hon. Member Sri Nagappa and other hon. Members were under rule 71. I pointed out that the question before us is not one of granting leave to introduce the Bill.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, the only point I would like to bring to your kind notice is with regard to the ordinances. The Hon. Finance Minister will kindly say whether I am correct ?

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE.—No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I find that hon. Members are agitated over the ordinance which is to be laid on the Table by the Hon. Minister for Co-operation. I shall hold over that item and take it up at a later date. With regard to other points I think I have given my ruling. No objection at the stage of introduction could be raised by hon. Members. If at all hon. Members have auy objection they could raise it at the time of considrations of the Bills. Even hon. Member Sri Nagappa can raise his objections at the consideration stage and certainly I shall permit him to raise it at that time.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, with due respect to the Hon. Chair, I would like to have a clarification. Suppose a Bill is directly sent to the Legislature Secretariat and no memher is aware of it and the Government is not supposed to give a copy of it to the members and if the Legislature Secretariat has published it without bringing it to the knowledge of the hon. Members. In such case, what is the right time for taking objection ? Sometimes when we want to raise an objection at the very stage of its publication the Assembly may or may not be in session. If the Assembly is in session definitely we can take objection under proviso to rule 71 of the Rules of Procedure. But if the Assembly is not in session, what is the mode under which a member can take objection regarding the constitutionality of the Bill. The Ruling that is given means that *suo motu* rules 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70 and 71 have all been abrogated and repealed by the Hon. Chair. Therefore I humbly submit that the very purpose of codifying the rules 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70 and 71 have been abrogated. Of course I quite understand that there is a difference between introduction of a Bill and leave to introduce a Bill. Further, I think that the Bill is going to be introduced before this House as per the list of business. Therefore, I submit that this is a right time to raise objection about the constitutionality of this particular Bill. I do not know whether this Bill has been published. But it is a right time for me to raise objection under Rule 71 (2). With regard to this particular Bill, which has been sought to be introduced, I have a point to be clarified. They are introducing certain provisions.....

4-00 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon. member is going into the merits. He may raise that objection at the consideration stage.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—According to the rules of procedure, the Governor's assent is also necessary. The financial memorandum is also not there. After fulfilling these conditions that are necessary, this Bill may be permitted to be introduced.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY. —As per the order paper, you were pleased to call the Hon. Chief Minister to introduce the Bill. He introduced the Bill. You said that the Bills are introduced. Then you were pleased to call the Hon. Minister for Finance to introduce the Sales Tax Bills and they have been introduced. Now the hon. Member Sri Nagappa is taking objection to the introduction of the Bills which have already been introduced.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—This is not correct.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—First, you were pleased to call upon the Chief Minister to introduce the Bills. He introduced them and then you called upon the Finance Minister to introduce his Bills, and they have been introduced. When this has been done, it is not open to the Hon. Members of this House to take objection or raise point of orders on a subject which has been disposed of.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—The Bills relating to Finance Minister are to replace the Ordinance No 3. In the earlier stage they were placed on the Table. Objection could be raised at the time of introduction. We have got every right to do so and you should allow the objection.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ (ಪಿರಿಯಾಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಸ್ವಾಮೀ, ತಾವು ಕ್ಷಮಿಸಬೇಕು. ನಾನು ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯದಕಡೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನವನ್ನು ಸೆಳೆಯಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಬಾರಿ ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತರೂ ನನಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ದೊರಕಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳುವುದು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನವನ್ನು ಸೆಳೆದು ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ? ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇಚ್ಛೆಪಟ್ಟರೆ ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನ ಸೆಳೆದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ? ನಾನು ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತರೂ ತಾವು ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಕರೆಯಲೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ವಿಧಿ ನಿಯಮಗಳ ಮೂಲಕ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೇ, ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ; ಸ್ಪೀಚ್ಛೆಯಾಗಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಏನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಬಂದಂತೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದೇ ಎಂದು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಎರಡನೇಯದು, ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಶಾಸನಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಬಂದಾಗ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅವರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿದು ಬಂದಿರುವ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮನ ಬಿಚ್ಚಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆಗ ತಾವು ಇದರ ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಮೊದಲೇ ಹೇಳಿಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿರುವ ನಮ್ಮಗಳಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ವ್ಯವಹಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಕೇಳ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗತಾನೇ ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ ಬಿಲ್ಲುಗಳು ಇಂಟ್ರಡ್ಯೂಸು ಆದವು ಎಂದು. ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ತಾವೂ ಬಿಲ್ಲುಗಳನ್ನು ಇಂಟ್ರಡ್ಯೂಸು ಮಾಡಿ ಯಾಯಿತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಇದರ ಮೇಲೆ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾನ ಹೇಗೆ ತಾನೇ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ? ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಯಾರೇ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಲೀ ಇಂತಹ ಶಾಸನಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಲು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ತಾವೂ ಕೇಳಿ ಆ ನಂತರ ಮುಂದುವರಿಯ ಬೇಕೇ ಏನಾ ನಮ್ಮನೆ ಶಾಸನಗಳನ್ನು ಆತುರಾತುರವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಧರ್ಮ ನ್ಯಾಯ ಉಳಿಯುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ?

ಮೂರನೆಯದು ತಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಧರ್ಮ ಹಾಗೂ ನ್ಯಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಜನತೆಗೆ ದೊರಕಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಇದನ್ನು ಜನತೆ ಕೂಡ ತಮ್ಮಿಂದ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಆಶಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿಯೇ ತಮ್ಮ ಸ್ಥಾನದ ಮೇಲೆ ತಕ್ಕಡಿ ಕೂಡ ಇದೆ. ಅದರಂತೆ ತಾವು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ನ್ಯಾಯ ದೊರಕುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ತಾವು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಅರಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ವಿನಯದಿಂದ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮತ್ತು ವಿಧಿ ನಿಯಮಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾನ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಸಾವಧಾನವಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಮಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅವನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಆ ನಂತರ ತಾವೂ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾನ ಮಾಡುವುದೊಳ್ಳೆಯದು.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾನು ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬಂತು. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರು, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಇಂಟ್ರಡ್ಯೂಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಬಿಟ್ಟರು. ಈಗ ಇಂಟ್ರಡ್ಯೂಸ್ ಮಾಡಾಯಿತಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಅಪ್ಪೋಸ್ ಮಾಡಲು ನಮಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಇನ್ನು ಉಳಿದಿರುವುದು ನಾವು ಮನೆಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದು ಒಂದೇ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಶಾಸನ ಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಸರಿಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಶಾಸನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಸಮಾಧಾನದಿಂದ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವಸರವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಶಾಸನ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ರೀತಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನನಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಮನನೊಂದಿದೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಶಾಸನಗಳು ಬಂದಾಗ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೇಳಬೇಕು. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾವು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇವೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಶಾಂತರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಕೆಳದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಏನು ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ?

ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ರೂಲ್ 64ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಒಂದು ಬಿಲ್ ಪಬ್ಲಿಷ್ ಆಗಬೇಕು. ಕಾನೂನು ಬಾಹಿರವಾದ ಅಥವಾ ಕಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನಿಗೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾದ ಒಂದು ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಪಬ್ಲಿಷ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಇಂಟ್ರಡಕ್ಷನ್ ಸ್ಟೇಜ್ ಏನು ಇದೆಯೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಪ್ಪೋಸ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ಅಬ್ಜೆಕ್ಷನ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮಗೆ ಇನ್‌ಹೆರಿಟೆಂಟ್ ರೈಟ್ಸ್ ಇದೆ. ರೂಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಅಮೆಂಡ್ ಆಗುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಇದೆ. ಅದು ನಮ್ಮ ಅನುಮೋದನೆಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೊ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥದ್ದನ್ನು ನೀವು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ನಿಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಗಲಾಟೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಡಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಡಿ. ಶಾಂತರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಕೂತುಕೊಂಡು ಕೇಳಿ, ಆಮೇಲೆ ನೀವು ಏನು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಹೇಳಿ.

†Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—I am not questioning the Ruling of the Chair. Nor am I speaking on what the Hon. Minister said. In addition to what Sri Nagappa said, I want to say one point as a matter of clarification. That would suffice. I would like to bring to your kind notice Rule 64, what actually it says is:

> "64: The Speaker may, on request being made to him, order the publication of any Bill (together with the Statement of Objects and Reasons) although no motion has been made for leave to introduce the Bill. In that case it shall not be necessary to move for leave to introduce the Bill, and if the Bill is afterwards introduced, it shall not be necessary to publish it again."

Now the question is whether leave to introduce the Bill has to be made. There are various stages for a Bill. This particular clause of the rule means: If the Hon. Minister who wants to introduce the Bill, makes a request to the Speaker that the Bill may be published, you order its publication. If it is published, then the question of introduction arises. That is the only point. The para pertains to publication before introduction and it does not take away the right of a Member to object to the introduction. The two are sought to be interlinked by you. That is not the purpose of this particular Rule. I therefore request that the point of order raised by Mr. Nagappa may be upheld.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I quite appreciate the sentiment expressed by the hon. Members Sri H. M. Channabasappa, Sri Siddaveerappa and Sri Sivappa that I should give a complete hearing. But then, after hearing the members when a ruling is given hon. Members sometimes they go on raising the same points again and stand up to speak. I cannot

understand that and it is not correct. After I have given a hearing to every Member, I give my ruling and again if hon. Members stand up and speak on the same point, there will be no end to it. After all, raising of points of order and their disposal should be very very brief.

(*At this stage some members entered the House*)

May I tell the hon. Members that when the Presiding Officer stands, nobody should enter the House and no Member of the House should be standing. Hon. Members are expected to be in their seats at least when the Chair is speaking.

In the British House of Commons, points of orders are raised and disposed of in half-a-minute. They conduct their business in a very efficient and businesslike manner. The rulings given by the Chair are respected even if they are wrong sometimes. It is for the Chair to come again before the House and say 'I have given a wrong ruling', the correct position is this. "But for the moment when the ruling is given on the floor of the House, it should not be challenged in the House. On such occasions, the hon Members should meet the Hon. Speaker in his Chambers and point out any defects". That is the procedure.

As regards the point raised by Sri M. Nagappa, I am not giving a new ruling. I am only clarifying the rule. Publication under 64 has got two effects; firstly it dispenses with the necessity for moving a motion for leave to introduce the Bill and secondly, it dispenses with the publication which is required unde rule 72. Mr. Nagappa raised a doubt, when requests are made for publication of Bills, how does the Secretariat or the Speaker permit such publication in the gazette? The position is, when the Bills come to the Legislature Secretariat, the Bill is subjected to examination. The Speaker also examines the Bill, and prima facie, if it is found that the Bills fulfil all the conditions laid down under the Constitution and the rules, they are permitted to be published in the Gazette. Not otherwise. May be, sometimes mistakes may occur. I do not claim infallibility either to myself or the Secretariat. Mistakes might be committed. But the remedy is, objections constitutional or otherwise can be taken at the stage of consideration but not at the introduction stage. Members do not lose their right by reason of permitting the introduction of a Bill. They can raise all their doubts and objections at the consideration stage

Sri M. Nagappa raised objection when the Hon Minister wanted to introduce the Bill included in the list of business. Hon. Member need not be agitated on this point which is very very simple. In the House of Commons, which is considered as the Mother of Parliaments, the first reading stage is simply a mechanical one. When the first reading is taken, the Speaker simply asks when is the second reading to come and who is the Member in charge of the second reading. It does not mean that the hon. Members of the House of Commons are prohibited from challenging the constitutional propriety at the stage of second reading. Therefore, hon. Members do not lose their rights of raising the relevant

(MR. SPEAKER)

points at the appropriate time. This explanation should suffice and set at rest further discusion on this point.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನೂ ಕೇಳಿ ನನಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಸಂತೋಷವಾಯಿತು. ಬ್ರಿಟಿಷ್ ಹೌಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಕಾಮನ್ಸ್ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ, ಅದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದುದು. ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಪದ್ಧತಿಗೆ ಅದು ಮಾತ್ಯಸ್ಥಾನ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯಗಳು ಹೇಗೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತವೆ, ಸರಕಾರದಿಂದ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ, ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ನಾನೂ ಕೂಡ ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ತರಹ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಅತುರಾತುರವಾಗಿ ಬಿಲ್ಲುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಓದುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಈ ತರಹ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನೂ ತಿಳಿಯಬೇಕು. ನಾನು ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಬಂದ ಮೇರೆ ಕೆಲವು ದಿವಸ ನನ್ನ ತಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅದೇ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಿದ್ದುವು. ಆದರೆ ಆಡಳಿತ ನಡೆಸುವವರಿಗೆ, ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಖಂಡಿತ ಮನ್ನಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ಗೌರವವಿದ್ದಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ಈ ಮಟ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಎದ್ದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದಂಥ ಉತ್ತಮವಾದ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಆಚರಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದು ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಪಾಲಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ತಥ್ಯವೇನಿದೆ ಅವತಿಯಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು ಬರಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕ, ಗ್ರಹಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನ ತಾವು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL.—Sir, I am extremely sorry for the remarks made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. All the while I was sitting looking into files. The Hon. Speaker directed me to introduce the Bill. In fact, on our own, we could introduce a Bill when it is put down in the List of Business. It is our duty to introduce the Bills when they are put down on the agenda. In addition, the Hon. Speaker directed me to introduce it. Then in compliance with the direction received from the Hon. Speaker, I rose in my seat and I introduced. I do not know what is wrong. I do not understand why these uncharitable remarks are being thrown at us.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I did not refer to any individual.

Mr. SPEAKER.—My request to the hon. Members is that they should have respect for one another. It is in an atmosphere of mutual respects that the proceedings could go on. Let everybody try in his own way to introduce that spirit of dignity and decorum. I have explained everything. If there is any doubt, I again tell Sri Nagappa that he will be permitted to raise his point of objection at the consideration stage.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Supposing a wrong ruling or illegal ruling is given, is there any remedy for this House ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I may inform the House that I had a very serious discussion about this in London. I do not want to disclose the name of the person with whom I had a discussion. I was told that a ruling, right or wrong has got to be respected at the time it is given and if on a second thought, the Speaker finds subsequently that the ruling is not correct, it is his duty to revise it and give a revised ruling in the House. The correct procedure to be followed in this connection is this : the hon. Members may meet the Speaker in his

Chamber and say that a particular ruling is wrong. If the Speaker is convinced about it, he can correct it. I won't hesitate to admit my mistake if there is a mistake. I do not consider myself to be infallible. The hon. Members are always welcome to meet me and point out that my ruling is wrong; or, on my initiative, if I find that I have unfortunately not given a correct ruling, I will come before this House and submit the correct position. I shall certainly do that. So with this explanation, I think the matter should be set at rest.

Sri K. H PATIL.—I always respect the ruling given by the Chair. We have no right to question it. In case the Bill which has been introduced or an ordinance which has been promulgated, contains a number of notifications which are not placed at the disposal of the members or not available at the Notice Office, are we not competent to raise that point?

Mr. SPEAKER.—You can raise all those points at the consideration stage.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—You were pleased to say that we can raise these objections under Rule 63, 64, 65, 66, 67 and 68. We have been raising these objections now so that tomorrow you might not say that no objections were raised.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—The Hon. Finance Minister has also introduced two Bills. In respect of them, the Hon. Chair may be knowing that I have moved two disapproval motions.

Mr. SPEAKER.—They will come at the consideration stage. I shall state the procedure. That procedure was followed recently in the Parliament in respect of the Bank Nationalisation Ordinance. The Bill was introduced along with the disapproval motion. I shall follow the same procedure here also. If and when the Government moves for consideration of a Bill, I shall also permit the members to move their resolution on it. The discussion on both the Bill and the resolution will proceed simultaneously. The Member's resolution will be put to vote first and then the Bill will be put to vote.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎನ್. ನಂಜೇಗೌಡ.—ತಮ್ಮಿಂದ ನನಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ಬೇಕು. ಒಂದು ಬಿಲ್ ಪಬ್ಲಿಷ್ ಆದಮೇಲೆ ಅದು ಇಂಟ್ರೊಡ್ಯೂಸ್ ಆದಹಾಗೆ ಆಯಿತು, ಆದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣಿಗಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವನ್ನು ಕನ್‌ಸಿಡರೇಷನ್ ಸ್ಟೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತರಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಬಿಲ್ಲುಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತರಬಹುದು, ಆಥವ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಯಾರಾದರೂ ತರಬಹುದು. ಪಬ್ಲಿಷ್ ಆದ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಬಿಲ್ಲೂ ಕನ್‌ಸಿಡರೇಷನ್ ಸ್ಟೇಜಿಗೆ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವ ಭರವಸೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಾ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The same consideration can be extended to the Private Members' Bills. Whatever I said will apply to the Private Members' Bills if they are published in the gazette.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ.—ನಾನು ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ತಾವು ಆರ್ಟಿಕಲ್ 213 ನ್ನು ಎರಡು ನಲ ಓದಿದಿರಿ, ತಮಗೆ ವಿಚಾರ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ 1969 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊರಟಿರುವುದು. ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ ಡಿಸ್‌ಅಪ್ರೂವಲ್ ರೆಸಲ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಪಾಸ್ ಆದರೆ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಇಂಟ್ರೊಡ್ಯೂಸ್ ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಥವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

4-30 P. M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The position is, they may themselves withdraw. Nothing prevents the Government from bringing in a Bill and that Bill will have to be rejected or accepted by this House. Even if your resolution is taken up first and is approved, nothing prevents the Government from introducing a Bill with retrospective effect. Therefore everything will be done in a constitutional manner and members might raise all your objections at the appropriate stage.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—It cannot be brought in the same session. There is a rule.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have given the ruling.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ (ಹುಲಿಯೂರುದುರ್ಗ).—ಶ್ರೀ ಶಿವಪ್ಪನವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಕೆಲವು ರಿಮಾರ್ಕ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದರು, ಅವರು ತಾವು ಫೈಲನ್ನು ನೋಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಫೈಲುಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಲು ರೂಲ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವರು ಫೈಲುಗಳನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Under the rules, hon. Member should attend to the business before the House. I do not know whether he was looking into the files pertaining to these Bills.

The Hon. Minister for Law will introduce the Madras Aliyasanthan (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1968.

Sri K.PUTTASWAMY.—I am not introducing it today.

Mysore Compulssory Primary Education (Amendment and Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill, 1968 and the Mysore Education Cess (Validation of Levy) Bill, 1969.

Introduction

Sri K. V. SHANKARA GOWDA.—I introduce : (i) the Mysore Compulsory Primary Education (Amendment and Miscellaneouse Provisions) Bill, 1968 and (ii) The Mysore Education Cess (Validation of Levy) Bill, 1969.

Mr. SPEAKER,—The Bills are introduced.

Regarding the Agricultural Produce Marketing (Regulation) (Amendment) Bill, I have said that it may be taken up later.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.— Sir, it will place us in difficulty.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This is a matter which at the time of introduction is likely to involve in some controversies. I have postponed its introduction in the interest of other business. One more reason is, the